

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WAYNE MATTHEW HASBROOK,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
DR. AUDREE ADREANA, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:25-cv-1131 CSK P  
ORDER

Plaintiff is a Sacramento County detainee.<sup>1</sup> On September 3, 2025, plaintiff filed a change of address, noting he is currently housed at the Mental Health Treatment Center. (ECF No. 21.) Multiple filings are before the Court; as discussed below, plaintiff's requests are denied.

I. Background

On June 23, 2025, the Court recommended that this action be dismissed based on plaintiff's failure to file an application to proceed in forma pauperis and a certified copy of his

---

<sup>1</sup> Sacramento County Superior Court records confirm that a criminal complaint was filed against plaintiff. People v. Hasbrook, No. 25MI003396. The court may take judicial notice of facts that are "not subject to reasonable dispute because it . . . can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned," Fed. R. Evid. 201(b), including undisputed information posted on official websites. Daniels-Hall v. National Education Association, 629 F.3d 992, 999 (9th Cir. 2010). It is appropriate to take judicial notice of the docket sheet of a California court. White v. Martel, 601 F.3d 882, 885 (9th Cir. 2010). The address of the official website of the Sacramento County Superior Court is <https://services.saccourt.ca.gov/PublicCaseAccess/Criminal/> (accessed Sept. 5, 2025).

1 inmate trust account statement, or pay the Court's filing fee. (ECF No. 19.) The findings and  
2 recommendations were re-served on plaintiff on August 19, 2025, but were returned by the post  
3 office on September 2, 2025, noting plaintiff had been released.

4 On September 8, 2025, plaintiff was granted an extension of time to file objections to the  
5 pending findings and recommendations, and to submit a completed application to proceed in  
6 forma pauperis and a certified inmate trust account statement for the six months prior to the filing  
7 of this action, or pay the Court's filing fee. (ECF No. 22.)

## 8 II. Discussion

9 As plaintiff was advised in the September 8, 2025 order, this action has not yet  
10 commenced because plaintiff has not paid the Court's filing fee or provided a completed  
11 application to proceed in forma pauperis accompanied by an inmate trust account statement for  
12 the six months prior to the filing of this case. The Court is unable to screen plaintiff's complaint  
13 until he pays the Court's filing fee or complies with the April 28, 2025 order. Further, this Court  
14 does not have jurisdiction over the issues he has raised in subsequent filings. See Younger v.  
15 Harris, 401 U.S. 37, 45 (1971) (when there is a pending state criminal proceeding, federal courts  
16 must refrain from enjoining the state prosecution absent special or extraordinary circumstances).<sup>2</sup>  
17 Indeed, his most recent request relates to plaintiff's "land dispute," which is not at issue in this  
18 case. (ECF No. 26.) Similarly, as noted in the Court's prior order, this Court cannot help  
19 plaintiff obtain benefits from the SSI, SSD, VA disability, home health or Indian Affairs. (ECF  
20 No. 22 at 2 n.2.) Thus, plaintiff's subsequent requests are denied. (ECF Nos. 24, 25, 26.)  
21 Plaintiff is advised that the Court will not address any further filings by plaintiff until he complies  
22 with the September 8, 2025 order.

23 ///

24 ///


---

25 <sup>2</sup> As plaintiff was previously informed, the state court docket in No. 25MI003396 confirmed that  
26 plaintiff was appointed counsel to represent him in the criminal proceedings, and that the case is  
27 set for further proceedings in state court. (ECF No. 22 at 2 n.3.) Because plaintiff is represented  
28 by counsel in the state court action, plaintiff should direct his request for assistance to his  
attorney, or raise them with the state court judge at the hearing. (Id.) Plaintiff's request to see a  
"civil rights public defender" (ECF No. 25) is denied.

1 III. Conclusion

2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's subsequent requests (ECF Nos.  
3 23, 24, 25, 26) are denied.

4 Dated: September 17, 2025

5   
6 CHI SOO KIM  
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8 /1/hasb1131.den2  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28